

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The attached replacement drawing(s) include changes to FIGS. 1-13, which have been amended to include the legend –PRIOR ART–.

REMARKS

I. Specification

During a July 21, 2006 phone conversation, the Examiner indicated Applicants need not provide a substitute specification, but instead may provide clarification of certain terms in the amended claims. In response, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify any potentially ambiguous terms as described in Paragraph V below.

II. Title

The Office has requested a new title asserting the current title is non-descriptive. In response, Applicants have amended the title to Mechanical Model Simulation Device, Method and Storage Medium.

III. Drawings

The Office has objected to the drawings requesting corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) and identifying Figures 1-13 as prior art. In response, Applicants have amended the drawings. Accordingly, reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

The Office has rejected claims 1-3, 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. 101 alleging the claimed invention is drawn to non-statutory subject matter since the claims are drawn to an abstract mathematical algorithm or disembodied program steps and are not tangible.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants have amended claims 1, 4 and 7 and canceled claim 2, 3, 5 and 6. As the Office has indicated, an invention which is eligible for patenting under 35 U.S.C. 101 must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." Amended claims 1 and 7 recite "displaying the extracted shape with an emphasis to facilitate viewing by the user thus reciting a "useful, tangible and concrete result." Accordingly, reconsideration is requested.

V. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The Office has rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office asserts meanings of "drive unit", "binding condition", "interlock", and "displays with high intensity" are ambiguous and the claims appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants have amended claims 1, 4 and 7 to remove ambiguities and correct grammatical errors, and have canceled claims 2, 3, 5 and 6. Accordingly, reconsideration is requested.

VI. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(b)

The Office has rejected claims 1-4, 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Naoki et al. ('Naoki') (of record). The Office asserts Naoki discloses: "based on three-dimensional shape and position information about each part stored in advance and information about a moving unit of each part, displaying the three-dimensional shape of each part and a model indicating the moving unit of each part, and specifying models of a plurality of moving units by a pointing device, thereby specifying a drive unit and a subordinately moving unit interlocked with the drive unit (par. 15-17, fig. 5, 10, 13). wherein said user interface unit further displays a binding condition of each moving unit and a direction of propagation of a movement of the interlock (par. 21-22, fig. 5, 10, 13)." Claim 5 was not examined with respect to the prior art.

Naoki does not suggest or disclose "displaying a constraint condition of each movable unit and a direction of propagation of a movement of a link, specifying a geometric constraint condition, displaying the geometric constraint condition, extracting a shape determined by the specified geometric constraint condition, and displaying the extracted shape with an emphasis to facilitate viewing by the user." as recited in amended independent claim 1 or "displaying a constraint condition of each movable unit and a direction of propagation of a movement of a link; specifying a geometric constraint condition; displaying the geometric constraint condition; extracting a shape determined by the specified geometric constraint condition; and displaying the extracted shape with an emphasis to facilitate viewing by the user." as recited in amended independent claims 4 and 7. In view of the foregoing, the Office is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 4 and 7.

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims 1, 4 and 7 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 have been cancelled and therefore claims 1, 4 and 7 are pending and under consideration. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 12, 2006

By: 

David J. Cutitta
Registration No. 52,790

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501